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Problem

› How can social interaction work?
  • Requires (i) coordinated action (ii) by two or more participants (iii) who have no access to each other’s intentions or understanding

› A problem of intersubjectivity:
  • How can two unique individuals have anything in common?

› Intersubjectivity is not “there”

(Schutz, 1967)
Intersubjectivity Assumed

> Participants will assume a shared understanding barring counterevidence
> Doing understanding is special

(e.g., Schegloff, 1992; Golato, 2010; Koivisto, 2015; Seuren, Huiskes, & Koole, in press)
Mechanism for Sense making

› Rules for producing action are the same as the rules for understanding action
› Interaction works if the rules are shared
› But how do the participants “know” that the rules are shared?

(Garfinkel, 1967)
Turn taking

› Participants in conversation take turns at talk
› Talk is largely organized through adjacency pairs
  • Current speaker selects next
  • Certain adjacency pair first parts accomplish selection
  • Constrain what next speaker can, or more accurately, should say

(Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff & Sacks, 1973)
Proof procedure

› A selects B to do a specific next action
› B will do (or will be seen to be doing) that specific next action
› Response shows how B understood A’s turn
Proof procedure

“Regularly, then, a turn's talk will display its speaker's understanding of a prior turn's talk, and whatever other talk it marks itself as directed to.”

(Sacks, et al., 1974: 728)
What about Speaker B?

- B displays to A how B understood A’s turn
- A now has evidence whether B understood him/her
- B does not have evidence whether s/he correctly understood A
Repair

› Repair opportunity at each point of possible completion
› Not initiating repair is orienting to a shared understanding
› If A does not initiate repair, s/he displays to B that B has displayed a correct understanding
› Moving on means adequate understanding

(Schegloff, 1992; Robinson, 2014)
Third position

> Speaker A can respond to B without (i) moving on or (ii) initiating repair.
> Sequence-closing thirds: e.g.,
  - Oh
  - Okay
  - Assessment

(Scheglof, 2007: 118ff.)
Example

[Rah:12:4:ST]

1 Jen: ->  = [Okay then I w]'z askin='er en she says yer
2    ->  working tomorrow ez well.
3 Ida: Yes I’m s’pose to be tihmorrow yes,
4 Jen: ->  O[h:::].
5 Ida:    [Yeh,

(Heritage, 2012: 10)
Additional proof

› Jenny receipts the response with oh: claims now-knowing
› Implies that she previously did not know
› Confirms that she had done a request for information (a “real” question)

(cf. Heritage, 1984)
Why confirm?

› Macbeth & Wong (2016: 587-588) take issue with term *confirm*

› What need has Ida?
  • Not initiating repair also, tacitly, confirms

› Why not with every action?
  • Lots of sequences have no third-position confirmation

› Ignores the parties’ local, demonstrable orientations and understanding
Sequential work

“A change-of-state token can mark or propose the possible end of a sequence. By registering a state-changing receipt of information, free-standing oh can serve as a possible sequence-closing, third position turn.”

(Schegloff, 2007: 119)
Third-turn proof procedure

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WhtKkl0L7Ek
Confirming by implication

> *Oh* does not seem to be *doing confirming* for the participants

> Does that mean we cannot or should not use it or other sequence-closing thirds?

> They are still there; they are used by the participants to structure their talk
Research Questions

› What need have participants of sequence-closing thirds?
› How can we as analysts use sequence-closing thirds to ground our analyses?
First action (i)

01  Nao  maare::hm: (1.1) ((slikt)) !•h
  but
  bute::hm: (1.1) ((swallows)) !•h

02

03  Que-> e:h >hoe laat< ben je thuis?
       how late are.SG you.SG home
  e:h >at what time< are you home?

04

05  Rom  Ans-> over: <half uur:tje ofzo>.
       in  half our.DIM or.something
       in: <half an hour or something>

*Silences are computer-timed, ±120ms longer (Kendrick & Torreira, 2015)
First action (i)

01  Nao  maare::hm: (1.1) ((slikt)) !•h
    but
    bute::hm: (1.1) ((swallows)) !•h

02

03  Que->  e:h >hoe laat< ben je thuis?
     how late are.SG you.SG home
     e:h >at what time< are you home?

04

05  Rom  Ans->  over: <half uur:tje ofzo>.
     in     half our.DIM or.something
     in: <half an hour or something>

06

07  Nao  SCT->  oh.
First action (i)

01 Nao maare::hm: (1.1) ((slikt)) !•h
   but
   bute::hm: (1.1) ((swallows)) !•h

02 (0.8)

03 Que-> e:h >hoe laat< ben je thuis?
   how late are.SG you.SG home
   e:h >at what time< are you home?

04 (2.3)

05 Rom Ans-> over: <half uur:tje ofzo>.
   in half our.DIM or.something
   in: <half an hour or something>

06 (0.5)

07 Nao SCT-> oh. (.) oké.
   oh okay
   oh. (.) okay.
First action (i)

01  Nao maare::hm: (1.1) ((slikt)) !•h
   but
   bute::hm: (1.1) ((swallows)) !•h
02                   (0.8)
03  Que-> e:h >hoe laat< ben  je    thuis?
    how late  are.SG you.SG home
    e:h >at what time< are you home?
04                   (2.3)
05  Rom  Ans-> over: <half uur:tje ofzo>.
    in     half our.DIM or.something
    in: <half an hour or something>
06                   (0.5)
07  Nao  SCT-> oh. (.) oké. (.) is goed.=
    oh     okay     is fine
    oh. (.) okay. (.) that’s fine.=
Sequence characterization

- Participants do question-answer sequence
  1. Naomi requests information
  2. Romy provides information
  3. Naomi receipts information

- *Is goed* characterizes sequences differently
  - Treats Romy’s response as making relevant (dis)agreement
  - Treats response as a “proposal”
Analyst or participants

- Naomi does not show she is eliciting a proposal
- Does Romy understand the Q as such?
  - Significant delay: 2.3s
  - Slow production
  - Slightly hedged: of zo
- Post hoc analysis!
More reasons for asking

01 Nao  
maare::hm: (1.1) ((slikt)) !•h
but
bute::hm: (1.1) ((swallows)) !•h

02

03 Que->  
e:h >hoe laat< ben je thuis?
   how late are.SG you.SG home
   e:h >at what time< are you home?

04

05 Rom Ans->  
over: <half uur:tje ofzo>.
in half our.DIM or.something
in: <half an hour or something>

06

07 Nao SCT->  
oh. (.) oké. (.) is goed.=
oh    okay    is fine
oh. (.) okay. (.) that's fine.=

08 =.hh doe je dan ↑wel effe::hm, (.) ! (0.3) de deur
   do you.SG then ADV just
op slot enzo,
on lock and.such
   =.hh will you then just, ! (0.3) lock the door and such,
First action (ii)

11 Kyr =en dA:n: gaan we mis↑schien heel even nog (0.2)
    and then go.PL we maybe very briefly still
12 e:hm (0.2) rondlopen door de stAd?en dan kom ik wel
    walk through the city and then come.SG I ADV
13 een keertje: richting ↑huis.
    a time direction home
14 (0.5)
15 Mar ’s ↑goed<? gezel[lig?
    is fine nice
>’s fine<? ni[ce?
First action (iii)

10 Suz niet duren want' er zit nog een groep na ast ons<.
not take because there sit still a group next to us
not take because there is a group after us<.

11 maar misschien dat 't eerder kla ar is °.
but perhaps that it earlier finished is
°but perhaps that it’s finished earlier °.

12 (0.5)

13 Emm (°ok é°)
okay
(°ok [ay °)
Third turn matters

> What need have participants of sequence-closing thirds?
  - No displayed understanding of Q as eliciting proposal until SCT!
  - At the very least a convenient resource
Third turn matters

> How can we as analysts use sequence-closing thirds to ground our analyses?
  - Third turn characterizes sequence
  - Participants local and displayed understanding
Always?

Next-turn proof procedure result of mechanics:
- Turn taking
- Conditional relevance

Sequence closing thirds
- Not conditionally relevant
- More “vague” display
- Primary task is sequence organizational
Outlook

› Other types of displayed understanding in third position
› How to balance the “local” and the “global” organization
  ▪ Here-and-now understanding
  ▪ Ex post facto understanding
Conclusion

- Third-turn proof procedure?
  - Probably not
- Provides further evidence
- Participants go beyond the adjacency pair, so should we
Closing third

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lHsPMxe7bOk
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Presuppositions

03 maar: ↑heb jij vandaag geen college; but have.SG you.SG today not class
but don’t you have class today;

04 (0.8)

05 Tin jawel ↑dadelijk om e:h v:ijf uur. yes in.a.moment at five o’clock
yes I do in a moment at e:h five o’clock;

06 (0.4)

07 Sus oké ↑ja ik dacht al: zoiets van:_
okay yeah I though already something like
okay yeah I already thought something like:_
Serious/non-serious

06 Bia
>↑ja ja ja<,
yeah yeah yeah
>yeah yeah yeah<,

07 (0.2)

08 >h[h hu hu .h (ja)] datte:h=der zijn een aa:ntal van:
yeah that there are.PL a number of

09 indeed,

10 Chr
[ pfth nou ]
PRT

[ pfth well ]

11 €v[:alt me weer mee:].€
((expression))
€t[hat’s not that bad.]